REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-16, and 22-30 are pending in the instant application. Among them, Claims 1, 3-6, 9-16, and 26-30 are withdrawn from further consideration for being directed to non-elected inventions. Applicants will cancel these claims as appropriate upon indication of allowable subject matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicates that two of the references in previously submitted IDS do not contain complete citation information, and requests Applications to provide full citation.

Applicants hereby provide the requested full citation for Ref. A6 and CK below.

- **A6** Leveugle *et al.*, "PSA-directed immunotherapy of prostate cancer," in *Proceedings of the American Association for Cancer Research Annual Meeting*, Vol. 39, p.355 (1 page), 3/1998.
- **CK** de La Salle *et al.*, "FcγR on Human Dendritic Cells," in *Human IgG Receptors*, pp. 39-55, van de Winkel Eds., 1996. (textbook, no volume).

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to add such information to the IDS, and include the two references on the face of any patent issuing from this application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 22-25 are rejected as allegedly indefinite because of the recited term "determining efficacy." Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the specification does not define "efficacy," thus it is allegedly unclear whether "efficacy" means the level of the immune T cell response, or the (therapeutic) efficacy as measured in relation to the patient being treated.

Applicants submit that, although the specification does not explicitly define "efficacy," it does mention "therapeutic efficacy" on page 34, first full paragraph, when discussing the results of treating patients. In addition, in the published specification (US 2006-0159688 A1), all claims

using "efficacy" (see published Claims 1, 12, and 22) refer to method steps to measure "the level of the antibody produced by the patient" (humoral response) or "the level of the T cell response produced by the patient" (cellular response).

Thus Applicants submit that the term "efficacy" as in Claim 22 is clearly intended to mean "the level of the T cell response produced by the patient," which does not require a therapeutic efficacy (*e.g.*, an improved symptom, *etc.*) in the patient. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 22-25 are also rejected for allegedly being indefinite because of the recited term "favorable determination."

To avoid potential confusion, Applicants have amended Claim 22 to replace "favorable determination" with "the efficacy of said xenotypic antibody-mediated immunotherapy" to obviate this rejection.

Claim 24 is rejected for allegedly being indefinite for reciting "T helper cell response is a cytotoxic T cell response."

Applicants have amended Claim 24 to depend on Claim 22, and to replace "T helper cell response" to "T cell response" to correct the obvious mistake. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Madiyalakan *et al.* (WO 97/42973, published 11/20/97) and further in view of Goletz *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,997,869, issued 12/99).

Claims 22-25 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Madiyalakan *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,241,985, filed 3/20/98) and further in view of Goletz *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,997,869, issued 12/99).

Applicants submit that the instant application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Application Number 09/871,339, filed May 31, 2001, which is a continuation of U.S. Application Number 08/913,290, now U.S. Patent 6,241,985, which is the U.S. National Stage of PCT Application Number IB96/00461, filed May 15, 1996, now published as WO 97/42973. *See* the specification amendment included in Applicants' response to Restriction Requirement.

The Examiner has not disputed the fact that the instant application is entitled to claim the benefit of the filing dates of its parent applications under 35 U.S.C. § 120. Accordingly, WO 97/42973 and U.S. Pat. No. 6,241,985 are both unavailable as prior art against the current application. The remaining reference of Goletz, standing alone, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response other than the fee for the extension submitted concurrently. However, if any other fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. **18-1945**, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw under Order No. **AREX-P03-005**.

Dated: May 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Yu Lu, Ph.D., J.D.
Registration No.: 50,306
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2624
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant